[29th January 1936

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"I do not think it will serve any useful purpose."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"May I ask if the Government propose to include the High Court services also and to have the selection for those services transferred to the Madras Services Commission?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"It cannot be done under the Statute; the Hon. the Chief Justice of the High Court has got the power to appoint his own officers."

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari:—"Are the Government prepared to amend the Act to provide for the Madras Services Commission selecting candidates for the High Court?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"If the hon. Member reads the new Government of India Act, he will find the provision there."

Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt:—"May I know whether there is a likelihood of the persons already selected not being appointed at all, if examinations are held every year?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"That is just possible."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I ask whether it is the intention of the Government that their orders regarding communal representation ought not to be given effect to in the High Court?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"I know of no such thing."

Insufficiency of accommodation for the Sub-Court and District Court at Salem.

* 538 *Q.*—Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the court-houses of the Sub-Court and the District Court at Salem are much cramped and that there is no sufficient seating arrangement in the court even for the lawyers, not to speak of the litigant public;

(*b*) whether there are any proposals for construction of new buildings or for extending the present ones; and

(*c*) if so, what they are and when they are to be accomplished?

A.—(*a*) The insufficiency of accommodation in the District Court and the Sub-Court at Salem has been brought to the notice of the Government; the Government have no information regarding the seating arrangements for the lawyers and the litigant public.

(*b*) & (*c*) A proposal for the construction of a combined court-house for the District Judge and the Sub-Judge at Salem, at an estimated cost of Rs. 2,38,000, was considered in connexion with the Budget for 1934–35. As this scheme was costly, it has been decided that it should be postponed for the present.

29th January 1936]

Mr. K. A. NACHIYAPPA GOUNDER:—"May I know whether the scheme is likely to be taken up?"

Expenditure on account of the Cocanada Conspiracy Case.

* 539 *Q.*—Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) the expenditure incurred by the Government in the prosecution of the Cocanada Conspiracy Case;

(*b*) the pay and expenses of the presiding judicial officer, clerks, etc., and the length of time taken for the trial of the case;

(*c*) the fees paid to the counsel;

(*d*) the other incidental expenses; and

(*e*) the further expenditure incurred by way of fees of counsel, etc., in the High Court?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The pay of the Additional District and Sessions Judge, East Godavari, who tried the Cocanada Conspiracy case was Rs. 2,250 inclusive of a judicial pay of Rs. 150 a month, during the period the case was heard by him.

The pay of the establishment sanctioned temporarily for the purpose of the case was as follows:—

(1) One translator ... Rs. 70 a month.

(2) One clerk ... ... Rs. 30 a month in addition to special pay for shorthand.

(3) Three peons on Rs. 12 each a month.

The Government have no information regarding the expenses apart from pay referred to by the hon. Member.

The case was heard from the 5th February 1934 up to the 21st April 1934.

(*c*) The fees sanctioned to the senior counsel were as follows:—

(1) Rs. 11,700 for conducting the prosecution in the preliminary enquiry.

(2) Rs. 19,600 for conducting the prosecution in the Sessions Court including a retainer of Rs. 1,000.

(3) Rs. 2,500 for opposing the appeals in the High Court.

As regards the junior counsel who was engaged to assist the senior counsel during the preliminary enquiry and in the Sessions Court, the District Magistrate, East Godavari, was authorized to sanction a fee not exceeding Rs. 50 a day for days on which the case was heard in Cocanada and Rs. 35 a day for days on which it was heard in Rajahmundry.

(*d*) & (*e*) The Government have no information beyond what is contained in the answers to clauses (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) of the question.